

REMARKS

A First Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed providing the U.S. equivalent of Reference AL – namely Reference AE – U.S. Patent 5,167,013; and also providing a new Reference AV.

The Examiner rejects claims 41-44 and 49-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Ooishi. Claims 45 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Ooishi further in view of Hirtenreiter. Claims 46-48 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Ooishi further in view of Manning.

Claim 41 distinguishes over Ooishi at least by reciting a document data stream for output on a print device. Nowhere does Ooishi disclose outputting on a print device. Rather Ooishi only shows in Fig. 2 a display unit 8a, 8b, or 8c.

Claim 41 next distinguishes by reciting the document data stream comprising an advanced function presentation print job data stream. Ooishi nowhere suggests such an advanced function presentation print job data stream.

Claim 41 next distinguishes by reciting that the font conversion table is stored in a resource file where the resource file comprises an object container selected via a job corollary file executed by a resource pack program. Fig. 3 of Applicants' drawings show the resource pack computer program 25 which executes the job corollary file. Ooishi nowhere shows or suggests a resource file comprising an object container selected via a job corollary file executed by a resource pack program.

The Examiner cites Figs. 3 and 5, and column 5, line 25 to column 6, line 29, 45-56 of Ooishi for disclosing that the delivery data is the presentation data stream which can be flexibly converted to be matched with the reception side, which is an

advance function; and the object container font conversion information is included in the file of the character code managing device, argued to be 4a and 4b containing objects. However, the recited advanced function presentation data stream is a print data stream and Ooishi nowhere discloses such an advance function presentation print job data stream. In Figs. 3 and 5 no print job is shown nor is any AFP data stream shown. Moreover, at column 5, line 25 to column 26, line 29, 45-56 there is no mention whatsoever of an advance function presentation (AFP). Furthermore, there is no mention of a job corollary file executed by the resource pack computer program.

The Examiner cites Hirtenreiter for selection of an object container occurring via a job corollary file – citing paragraph 9, and paragraphs 31-32. But one skilled in the art would never combine Hirtenreiter with Ooishi to solve the problem of font conversion. Hirtenreiter relates to a processing of a color conversion table having nothing to do with fonts in relation to an advance function presentation print job document data stream. Therefore there is no connective teaching between Hirtenreiter and Ooishi.

Paragraph 9 the color conversion table is discussed at four lines at the end of the paragraph, not a font conversion information as recited in Applicants claim 41. Similarly at paragraphs 34 and 35, color conversion tables are discussed. There is no mention of font conversion information.

For the above reasons, allowance of claim 41 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 46-48 depend from claim 41 and are allowable at least for the reasons claim 41 is allowable and also by reciting additional distinguishing features in combination.

Independent system claim 49 is similar to method claim 41 and in view of the similar recitations, claim 49 distinguishes in the manner described above with respect to claim 41. Dependent claims 54-56 are allowable at least for the reasons claim 49 is allowable and also by reciting additional features in combination.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

Patent Department - **CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 258-5786

Attorneys for Applicant